



David A. Nilson
CTO
2620 SW 27th Avenue
Miami, FL 33133-3001
Phone: (305) 476-4201
FAX: (305) 443-9516
Email dnilson@STIS.com

December 26, 2001

VIA FACSIMILE, FEDERAL EXPRESS

Sandra C. Jones
Sales Assistant Vice President
BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
1960 West Exchange Place
Suite 200
Atlanta, Georgia 30084

Re: "Conversion" of Supra's customer base to UNE combination billing

Dear Ms. Jones

Your letter of December 20, 2001 arrived by Federal Express the morning of December 24, 2001. Much of what we discussed on November 9th and my comments to your letter were rendered moot by the Award of the Tribunal dated December 21, 2001, which states that BellSouth must:

Convert Supra's customers from resale to UNE customers without disconnection or disruption of Supra's customers' service or the "stripping" or "clarification" of Supra's customers' existing features or services. BellSouth is to complete the conversion of Supra's customers by January 31, 2002.

While I concede that Don Smith, Zena Durr, Sandra Jones and I had a conference call on November 9, 2001, we seem to differ on some of the issues and their conclusions. You state that it has been over a month and BellSouth has not heard from me on this matter. After our call on the 9th, I left for Atlanta arriving early morning on the 11th of November, to attend to matters regarding the commercial arbitration proceeding between our companies. For at least three weeks following that call, you know full well that I had to spend my time dealing with issues in that proceeding, issues which deal with BellSouth's numerous breaches and intent to harm Supra. Further, BellSouth unexpectedly made this an issue during the arbitration as clearly seen by the Tribunals award dated December 21, 2001.

What you had previously asked me to do was to convince my management team to discard its heartfelt concerns over the serious and disruptive issues that will occur if the "conversion" proceeds as planned by BellSouth, without addressing any of the issues we raised at that meeting, some going back to June 18, 2001. Let us be clear – we view this as another in a long line of bad faith actions taken with the intent to harm Supra.

First, given that we were conducting discovery and preparing for Arbitration, we went out of our way to make time for the conference call that Don Smith requested. It was a pleasure to find out, after all these months, that Don and you were responsible for this implementation, and that you had done substantial work that you felt would have a positive result. Its a shame we could not have contributed earlier and in light of the Tribunals award of December 21, 2001 requiring the conversion to proceed without incident, we hope BellSouth now takes our issues mores seriously.

It was with great suprise that I read your most recent letter, as I believed that BellSouth was working to resolve the issues we presented you on November 9th. To make sure they are well understood I repeat them, as we have yet to get your response to them.

Issue 1 - BellSouth's intentions to use LENS, TAG, LEO and LESOG. The testimony of your legal team has been in sharp conflict with your corporate representative regarding the necessity to "reprogram" the end office switches in order to implement UNE combination billing. It now appears quite clear that this is an OSS, not a switch function. As, such forcing accounts through the LENS - TAG - LEO - LESOG - LCSC gauntlet before passing the order to SOCS is totally unnecessary and designed to cause harm to Supra. Further, we stated that we did not believe that the orders even had to go through SOCS, that there were other mechanisms at your command.

Issue 2 - The MemoryCall problem that existed until at least July has not been fixed. Neither Don nor you were able to affirmatively state that the problem had been corrected. Furthermore, BellSouth estimated that this would reduce customer problems by half, but not eliminate them.

Issue 3 - BellSouth intends to provision 100 customers a day, everyday, and build in a lag time to watch the orders. With no gaps in the cycle, a tremendous amount of problem orders could be in the system by the time a problem is detected. Supra heard your plan to "start slow", but suggested the need to do a group and check before turning the process full on. We agreed in concept, but not implementation. Supra's request was not documented or answered in Don's November 9 letter.

Issue 4 - Can BellSouth guarantee that with the RRSO code that the orders will be issued / processed correctly to avoid loss of dialtone. The answer to this was no, and we asked what other methods could be employed. Supra's request was not documented or answered in Don's November 9 letter.

Issue 5 - We requested a list of USOCs

(a) that have to be removed from the account

(b) a list of Resale USOCs with their UNEP equivalent

I specifically recall that Don asked you to work with the training facilitators to provide a list, or a modified Training Guide with a list of USOCs that that have to be deleted or changed. You were reluctant to agree to that without discussing it with someone else,

and Don's November 9 letter or any subsequent correspondence from you did not cover the issue.

Issue 6 - Holdfile errors. Currently it takes up to 30 days to clear holdfile error due to workload, backlog, staffing issues. During the call, your SME stated that you had a person, from the holdfile group, to clear holdfile errors during this conversion. Since BellSouth only has three people assigned to clear holdfile errors over the nine-state region, what is going to happen to holdfile clearing times of all other orders? Supra has request to convert holdfile errors that have not been cleared for up to 6 months now.

Issue 7 - CSOTS update latency time. Currently CSOTS updates occur 24-48 hours AFTER the order takes place. Since BellSouth is only planning a 3 day due date delay to view the orders, it is possible that orders will process before they can be viewed in CSOTS depending upon the time of day the order is placed and when the CSOTS system is updated.

Issue 8 - Continued use of the D and N order. Putting aside Supra's abhorrence of the use of the D/N order along with its anti-competitive implications it raises, there is a serious and functional problem. BellSouth's OSS's sends a loss notice to the Primary interLATA carrier (i.e. Long Distance Carrier) advising the Long distance company that the BellSouth account has been disconnected. The OSS then insists on changing the customer code on a New Connection order. The result is that the customer's long distance calling plan is cancelled, and the customer gets billed at the LD carriers HIGHEST rate (casual calling) as a brand new customer without any history or discounts. If a reseller of the LD carrier at a very low rate was billing the customer, the negotiated rate will be lost. This will be perceived as our error.

Issue 9 - Will BellSouth accept responsibility for this problem and provide monetary reimbursements for the adjustment of the long distance charges billed incorrectly? Will BellSouth accept responsibility before the FPSC and the FCC for customer complaints on this issue?

Issue 10 - Will BellSouth agree not to use any of these problems to winback any of Supra's converted customers?

Issue 11 - Many complaints are now before the FPSC where LENS correctly show the customers intraLATA LPIC as 5124, but traffic is being routed to LD carriers other than BellSouth. So far, PREDICTOR has shown that LENS and the Switch do not have the same LPIC. Will BellSouth be verifying PREDICTOR to eliminate this problem during conversion?

Issue 12 - Local Service Freeze. BellSouth requires Supra to have a different Operating Company Number (OCN) for resale than for UNE combinations. As discovered on June 18, 2001, and subsequently documented in the IDS complaint in Florida, BellSouth's system REFUSES to convert a customer from resale to UNE combination if the Local Service (anti slamming flag) is set. In this conversion the local service provider DOES NOT CHANGE. It is a BellSouth system error that should have

been fixed long ago. BellSouth's suggestion was to issue three orders, one to remove, change and replace the local service freeze. Of course this gives the LENS - LEO - LESOG gauntlet three times as many chances to disappoint our customers with no disincentive for BellSouth to avoid the problem. Again, as stated in issue 1 this is another "artifact" or the bad decision to use LENS for this job.

Issue 13 - Supra had over a 65% fallout of orders placed under the supervision of BellSouth trainers on June 18, 2001, and despite documenting these promptly to both Greg Follensbee and Don Smith, we still have no corrective action information with which to prevent future occurrences. Don did address this in his letter as a failure to respond to a clarification by Supra.

Issue 14 - LENS does not show the Local Service Freeze Flag. No CLEC can ever see if it is in place via LENS. The clarification language for this event has NOTHING to do with the words "Local" or "Freeze", and as stated above, there is no way to tell this is the problem in LENS. Supra's inability to respond to the clarification is a direct result of the nonsensical clarification language. Don's Letter states that there were 58,000 accounts without local Service Freeze on June 5, 2001. This disagrees sharply with our records and policies, and represents a large potential problem.

We hope this refreshes your recollection of the action items brought forward at this meeting and that a side by side reading of this letter and Don Smith's letter indicates that there is still work to be done on BellSouth's part.

If you or anyone else at BellSouth needs to discuss what can and has to be done to implement this portion of the award, please contact me directly at 305-476-4202.

Thank You

David A. Nilson
CTO
Supra Telecom

Cc: Olukayode A. Ramos
Brian Chaiken, Esq.
Mike Twomey, Esq.
Nancy White, Esq.
